

REMARKS

In the Office Action of February 17, 2005, the Examiner objected claim 81 because of the following informalities: it depends from claim 63, while the pattern of claim dependency in other claims indicates that Applicants may have intended claim 81 to depend from claim 67.

Applicants have amended claim 81 to depend from claim 67 to overcome the Examiner's objection.


The Examiner rejected all pending claims 47-83 under judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting and indicated that a terminal disclaimer would overcome the double patenting rejection.

In this response, Applicants have submitted a timely filed terminal disclaimer and a check for the disclaimer fee.

Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are now in condition for allowance and this amendment should be entered. Please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any fee deficiency associated with this response.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 4/6/2005 By:   
James C. Scheller  
Reg. No. 31,195

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025  
(408) 720-8300